

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

RANDY HERMAN,

Plaintiff,

v.

LACKAWANNA COUNTY, *et al.*,

Defendants.

CIVIL ACTION NO. 3:CV-13-1697

(JUDGE CAPUTO)

(MAGISTRATE JUDGE CARLSON)

ORDER

NOW, this 15th day of June, 2015, upon review of the Report and Recommendation of Magistrate Judge Martin C. Carlson (Doc. 29) for plain error or manifest injustice,¹ **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that:

- (1) The Report and Recommendation (Doc. 29) is **ADOPTED**.
- (2) The Amended Complaint (Doc. 28) is **DISMISSED with prejudice**.
- (3) The Motion to Add Additional Defendants (Doc. 46) is **DENIED as moot**.
- (4) The Motion for Extension of Time to File Addendum (Doc. 49) is **GRANTED**.
- (5) The Clerk of Court is directed to mark the case as **CLOSED**.


A. Richard Caputo
United States District Judge

¹ Where objections to the Magistrate Judge's report are filed, the court must conduct a *de novo* review of the contested portions of the report. *Sample v. Diecks*, 885 F.2d 1099, 1106 n.3 (3d Cir. 1989) (citing 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(c)). However, this only applies to the extent that a party's objections are both timely and specific. *Goney v. Clark*, 749 F.2d 5, 6-7 (3d Cir. 1984). Here, Plaintiff's objections (Docs. 45; 48; 51) fail to address any of the Magistrate Judge's reasons for recommending that this action be dismissed. As such, the Report and Recommendation has been reviewed for clear error or manifest injustice. *See, e.g., Cruz v. Chater*, 990 F. Supp. 375, 376-77 (M.D. Pa. 1998).